

NOV 06 2006

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed on September 19, 2006 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-15, 17-19, and 21. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to place the claims and the application in a form that is in condition for allowance. Claims 3, 8, 9, 16, and 20 were previously cancelled. After entry of this response, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-15, 17-19, and 21 remain pending in the above-identified patent application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed September 19, 2006 and render all pending claims at issue patentably distinct over the cited references.

I. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-15, 17-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, with regard to claims 1, 11, and 21, the Office action states that an identity stored in the memory is specified, but the claims allegedly do not specify what the identity is used for or why it exists. Examiner Rimell states that this can be clarified by specifying that the owner associated with the specified identity modifies the data object. Claims 1 and 21 are allegedly indefinite because each of claims 1 and 21 are apparatus claims and it is not clear whether the method steps defined in the last lines of the claims are actually further limiting the apparatus. Examiner Rimell states that this can be clarified by stating wherein the apparatus is configured so that the object owner can modify the data object. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended according to Examiner Rimell's suggestions and now overcome the 112 rejections. Accordingly, these claims and the claims that depend therefrom, e.g. claims 2, 4-7, 10, 12-15 and 17-19, are now allowable. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Appl. No. 10/059,074

Amdt. Dated November 6, 2006

Reply to Office action of September 19, 2006

NOV 06 2006

II CONCLUSION

In view of Applicant's amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 112, have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorneys at the telephone number below.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 11/6, 2006By: Cindy H. Kwacala
Reg. No. 47,667

Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz, P.C.
7150 E. Camelback Road
Suite #325
Scottsdale, AZ 85251